

IN SENATE
OF
THE UNITED STATES,

JANUARY 12, 1818.

The Committee of Claims, to whom was referred the petition of Nathaniel Cutting,

REPORT:

The petitioner acts as a clerk in the Department of War, and receives an annual salary of \$1430, and has acted in this capacity for more than eight years, and in other public employments for a much longer period. He alleges that at no time has the compensation allowed him covered his inevitable current expenditures.

The petitioner asks for a grant of land in the unappropriated parts of the reserve designated for grants to the revolutionary army. The petitioner accompanies his petition with letters from those with whom he acted in office, highly approbatory of his public service; indeed, the committee are aware, from personal observation, of the petitioner's merits. Though acting under the full effect of feelings of approbation, the committee cannot recommend the allowance of the grant. It would be, they believe, entirely novel in its principles, and appears to present features of inconveniencies insuperable to its practice. The committee submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That the petitioner have leave to withdraw his petition.

[51]

IN SENATE

67

THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 12, 1818.

The Committee of Claims, to whom was referred the petition of
James G. Thompson,

REPORT

The petitioner acts as a clerk in the Department of War, and re-
ceives an annual salary of \$1,500, and has acted in this capacity for
more than 25 years, and is now public employments for a month
longer period. He alleges that at no time has the compensation al-
lowed him covered his inevitable current expenditures.

The petitioner asks for a grant of land in the unappropriated
parts of the reserve designated for grants to the Revolutionary army.
The petitioner acknowledges his petition with letters from those who
would be acted in order, being a statement of his public service, in-
cluding the committee and answer from the said statement of the
petitioner's merits. Though acknowledging the full effect of such
a recommendation, the committee cannot recommend the allowance
of the grant. It would be, they believe, entirely novel in its object,
and appears to present a number of considerations in opposition
to the grant. The committee submit the following as a solution
of the case. For the petitioners have leave to write on his petition.